



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*cln*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,262	03/24/2004	Kazuhiko Fukazawa	119216	3894
25944 7590 02/20/2007 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER KARLSEN, ERNEST F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/20/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/807,262

Applicant(s)

FUKAZAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Ernest F. Karlsen

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I and Species 7 (claims 22-27) in the reply filed on November 20, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the groups share the same classification and no burden would be presented in examining all claims. This is not found persuasive because Applicants have not shown that the groups are not patentably distinct. Admission on the record by Applicants that the groups are not patentably distinct will result in rejoinder. Applicants appear to be arguing that same subclass of classification means same invention. If such were carried to its logical conclusion there could only be one patent per subclass and Applicants could be denied a patent on the basis that there is already at least one patent in class 250, subclass 559.45. With regard to the "no burden" argument, it is noted that each distinct invention beyond one is a burden in that it draws the attention of the Examiner to its own requirements. Examination requires focus to follow search leads and patterns of logic in formulating applications of the prior art to that which is claimed. When the Examiner has to pursue several search patterns of logic simultaneously or serially, added burden is presented. In order to examine several inventions and/or species simultaneously or serially, added effort beyond that necessary for one invention or species must be expended. Where the effort is serial and the jobs are different the added burden is obvious. Digging two equal holes of the same size requires twice the effort of digging one hole. Such is an obvious conclusion. It can be argued that some inventions or species can be examined simultaneously but such is true only if they are not patentably distinct, that is, if that which applies to any one applies to all others. Where inventions or species are patentably distinct each requires separate

Art Unit: 2829

consideration. As a for instance, consider a properly restrictable apparatus and method of use of that apparatus where one has details without correspondence in the other.

Finding references anticipating or making obvious one does not necessarily render the other unpatentable. Having to examine the other constitutes a burden. If the apparatus and method of the above example are not patentably distinct no burden is presented in examining both since if one falls the other falls as well. As a second for instance, consider a properly restrictable combination and subcombination where all the details of the subcombination are not necessary for the combination. Finding references anticipating or making obvious one does not necessarily render the other unpatentable. Having to examine the other is a burden. If the combination and subcombination of the above example are not patentably distinct no burden is presented in examining both since if one falls the other falls as well. Admission on the record that the groups are not patentably distinct will result in rejoinder. With regard to the traversal of the requirement to elect species, Applicants have not shown that the species as set forth are usable together.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Inventions and/or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on November 20, 2007.

Claims 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Art Unit: 2829

applicant regards as the invention. Claim 22, lines 6 and 7 state that a predetermined portion of the substrate is inspected by the second inspection apparatus and lines 8-10 state that information in the storage unit determines where the second inspection apparatus inspects. Lines 6-10 of claim 22 are inconsistent. In addition claim 22, line 7, refers to "the substrate" when all previous mention is of "substrates".

It is requested that Applicants identify where in the specification there is support for claim 22.

If in claim 22, lines 6-7 "a predetermined portion of" were not present, the following rejection would be made:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alumot et al. Alumot et al show a first inspection apparatus (that which is connected to element 6 of Figure 1), a storage unit in the main controller 8 (see col. 5, lines 45-50) and a second inspection apparatus (that which is connected to element 10 of Figure 1) wherein the content of the storage unit 8 determines where the second inspection apparatus inspects (see col. 2, lines 4-20 and col. 5, lines 23 –34).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Levy et al is cited to show an overlay inspection apparatus.

Art Unit: 2829

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ernest F.

Karlsen at telephone number 571-272-1961.

Ernest F. Karlsen

February 13, 2007

  
ERNEST KARLSEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER